

Appendix

Our Foreign Policies and Our Entanglements in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to call the attention of my colleagues to, a speech by Indiana's senior Senator, the Honorable R. VANCE HARTKE.

In his address, delivered before the Jacobi Society on February 6, Senator HARTKE offers a deep insight and a profound analysis of our foreign policies and of our entanglements in southeast Asia.

The speech follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE AT THE JACOBI SOCIETY DINNER, STATLER HILTON, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 6, 1965

In 1945 President Roosevelt said: "The mere conquest of our enemies is not enough. We must go on to do all in our power to conquer the doubt and fears, the ignorance and the greed which made this horror possible."

It is in this context that I would like to discuss with you tonight the American role in a seething world, a world in which we have been forced to take the leadership.

Often in recorded history destiny knocks at the door with an iron clang. In our own short time as a nation, history has come to our door 3 times—once when we faced the impossible odds of the British power as we sought our own freedom; a 2d time when President Lincoln sought 75,000 volunteers to preserve the Union; and now in the 20th century when destiny has knocked almost constantly. Through involvement in world affairs brought on by our own success and by the ever-shrinking size of the globe, we have had to take up the task of defending the free world and the very concepts of the Judeo-Christian civilization.

The immediate question is not whether we are to become embroiled in a full-scale major nuclear war which could be the Armageddon of the Bible. Rather, it is a question of what our policies should be to bring lasting peace, freedom, political self-determination, economic development, and personal dignity to the world.

As always, the long-range idealistic goals of our Nation are threatened by an enemy. Aligned against us now is international communism. I agree with President Theodore Roosevelt when he said: "We Americans have many problems to solve, many threatening evils to fight and many deeds to do. If—as we hope and believe—we have the wisdom, the strength, the courage, and the virtue to do them, we must face facts as they are. We must not surrender ourselves to a foolish optimism nor succumb to a timid and ignoble pessimism. Our Nation is the one among all nations of the earth which holds in its hands the fate of the coming years * * *. I believe firmly that we shall succeed."

I am subscribing to the goal of victory for us—for the free world.

In the early years of the Communist international conspiracy, the strategy was to operate from within a country and to promote revolution. The world Communist foreign policy has, in the last 15 years, turned to so-called wars of liberation, while from Moscow have come efforts toward peaceful coexistence.

Thus the Soviet Union has been able to take its seat in peaceful international relations while at the same time appealing to the have-not nations of the world, principally in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The posture of peaceful coexistence has served to allay fears of the neutrals, and to weaken the Western bloc. The so-called wars of liberation have taken a greater toll because we have not always known how to cope with them. Sometimes, we have made serious mistakes with long-term consequences. Sometimes we have vacillated until we were misunderstood or misinterpreted.

The difficulty is compounded because emerging people in newly independent countries see us less in the light of our own Revolution for freedom than they do as allies of those they regard as colonial imperialists.

We must expose the Communists—Russian and Chinese—as the true imperialists they are. And we must learn to distinguish between the ferment of people seeking freedom and the right to control their own destinies free of despotism on the one hand, and the revolutions and infiltrations inspired by Moscow and Peking on the other.

I see little to distinguish the Soviet brand of communism from the Chinese brand. Any competition between the two—in Asia or anywhere else on the globe—can be of little encouragement to us now or in the foreseeable future because it is a competition of deviousness.

The synthesis of our final goals and those of the Communists—as well as this competition of deviousness—is in southeast Asia. At this moment, we are pouring men, material, and money into a place few Americans had heard of a few years ago, in order to meet a commitment to self-determination, to individual freedom, to economic development, and to our own long-term self-interest. On the other side are the Communists.

The active fighters are Asians trained and promoted by the Chinese Reds. Yet, their competitors in deviousness and duplicity are also at work. Russian Premier Alexi Kossygin has gone to Hanoi to show that the Soviet Union also is allied against us.

While we are not alone in Vietnam, having been joined by other SEATO nations including Australia, we are the chief supporters of a South Vietnam that is torn internally.

Since 1954 we have poured nearly \$4 billion into South Vietnam in military and economic aid. That amounts to more than \$266 for each of the 15 million South Vietnamese. Our aid figure today amounts to about \$2 million a day. We have some 21,000 U.S. troops in that beleaguered land. Two hundred Americans have died there and additional hundreds have spilled their blood. More than 125 ships and airplanes of the 7th Fleet are committed to the waters around this peninsula.

How did all this happen? What are we doing in Vietnam?

For a hundred years before World War II,

Indochina was a colony of France, ruled by a colonial Governor but with representation in the French Assembly. During the war, the Japanese moved in, but when France tried to return, the colonial peoples of the region—which included the present Laos, Cambodia, and both Vietnams—revolted for independence. Nationalist groups wanted permanent independence; Communist-organized groups saw this as the first step toward delivering the whole peninsula into the Communist camp. But all were united on getting rid of the French.

The Communists were strongest in the area that is now North Vietnam, which is closest to mainland China, from which Chiang Kai-shek had been driven in 1949. In Laos, another Communist force, the Pathet Lao, controlled a large area in the northern part of the country. With outside aid, it seemed very possible that the Communists would achieve dominance.

At the same time, since the revolt against France included not only local Communists but other groups who sought democratic independence, the United States could not intervene on behalf of France without violating our principles of support of colonial people seeking freedom. But John Foster Dulles warned Russia and China against trying to pick up the pieces, even before the French defeat.

Settlement after the fall of the French came in an international conference at Geneva, where on June 21, 1954, agreements were signed to draw a cease-fire line across Vietnam. The northern half became the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, built around Ho Chi Minh's Communist forces, with 17 million people to South Vietnam's 14 million, and with the bulk of the industrial areas. The compromise was supposed to prevent civil war, and provided for a permanent settlement after all Vietnam election in July 1956. The situation was very much a parallel to that which created North and South Korea.

Most observers in 1954 felt that Laos and South Vietnam would have a short life, perhaps no more than 6 months, before the Communists took them over. Ngo Dien Diem had become the Premier of South Vietnam 2 weeks before the Geneva agreement. Our problem was to decide whether we should keep hands off, which was the French position; based on belief that it was impossible to save Indochina from the Communists. The other alternative was to give support to Diem, a staunch anti-Communist who had spent many years in the United States.

U.S. advisers and experts were divided. Those who urged help to Diem included Senators Mike Mansfield and John F. Kennedy, who believed Diem could save his country with our help. In September of 1954 the southeast Asia treaty organization came into being, and SEATO was persuaded by Dulles to give Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam guarantees against invasion from North Vietnam. Once the decision was made, we were committed. We could not withdraw. Many say we still cannot without loss of "face."

For 3 years things were relatively quiet. Convinced they could not open direct attack, the Communists reverted to slow infiltration and buildup, especially in Laos. Diem took in nearly 900,000 Vietnamese from the north under a treaty provision which allowed exchange, but only a few left the south. In October 1955, the playboy king, Bao Dai,

A633

was ousted and Diem became President of the Republic of South Vietnam. By 1961 South Vietnam had a per capita income of \$110. North Vietnam had only \$70 per person of income. Food production in the north was off 10 percent per capita. In the south, it was up 20 percent.

Part of the credit for the buildup in South Vietnam was clearly ours as we helped train and equip the armies against an expected invasion from the north.

The Chinese, meanwhile, were not to quit. Nor was Russia to fail to exploit the situation.

Infiltration by guerrillas was stepped up from North Vietnam by Chinese Reds while the Soviets fomented trouble in Indonesia and other nearby areas.

Russia sought to paint us as imperialists bent on imposing the white man's rule on Asians and, just this week, has agreed to supply airplanes to North Vietnam.

There is, of course, great and selfish interest, especially by Red China, apart from embarrassing us. Peiping has compelling reasons for coveting all the countries to the south. Southeast Asia would complement China, which is overpopulated and underfed. Southeast Asia grows more food than it needs. Thailand, for instance, normally is the fourth largest grain exporter in the world.

Of interest to both China and Russia, are these impressive figures on southeast Asia—production of 85 percent of the world's natural rubber, 55 percent of its tin and much of the oil in the Far East.

Future industrial and military power rides on the outcome of the wars on the peninsula of southeast Asia, the former Indochina, now North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Control of the area would place Communists astride sea and air lanes between Indian and Pacific Oceans, between Far East and South Asia.

Should Vietnam fall to communism, Malaysia, Thailand, Burma, and India could soon become victims of aggression. Eventually, Australia could become the target even as it was of the Japanese during World War II.

Ever since the beginning of the guerrilla warfare the United States has been committed by its treaty obligations and by the theory of prior administrations that the rest of the countries will fall should South Vietnam and Laos fall to the Communists. The so-called Domino theory.

The true beginnings of this struggle are hard to ferret out. Perhaps, as some say, they go back to our policy in China after World War II. Perhaps, as others say, the policy laid down in Korea of allowing the enemy to escape beyond a certain line is at fault. Perhaps, we have gone too far. Perhaps we have gone not far enough.

Perhaps our negotiated peace in Korea is interpreted as a pattern proving that we do not honor our commitments or that we are a paper tiger.

Perhaps the agreement our Government gave to the neutralist government of Laos is a pattern.

Small wonder, then, that responsible officials of our Government are calling for withdrawal while others are calling for extending the war into North Vietnam and for the bombing of Hanoi and guerrilla supply lines.

Small wonder that the Vietnamese people on our side of the line wonder where we stand.

We have in our zest to see our allies win, supported successive governments that do not have any popular base to which we say we are committed. And we have, at the same time, declined to extend the war or allow it to be extended. Perhaps both can be justified. In the short term goal of keeping South Vietnam free from communism without touching off the trigger of an atomic war. But these facts and our own conflicting statements about the extent to

which we are committed with manpower cause confusion in Vietnam. Remember that we increased our force to some 21,000 from 12,000 at about the time we said we were going to bring 1,000 home. Remember that we have had three Ambassadors in 4 years.

So, while four members of the President's Cabinet offered to replace Henry Cabot Lodge, indicating the importance our Government gives to Vietnam, there is ample cause for wondering in southeast Asia how we intend to reinforce this feeling of importance.

We can wonder, then, whether Sukarno of Indonesia might be less anti-American if he understood what we are doing and where we are headed. Indeed, would he be telling us to keep our aid if he knew we honor our commitments and are steadfastly proceeding to a goal?

Let me pause a minute to emphasize my own contempt for Mr. Sukarno's attitude and that of Nasser and any others who tell us to jump in the lake.

I have been a supporter of economic and military aid for our allies as a matter of decency, good will, and self-interest. I have supported recent cuts in foreign aid. And I am probably the principal advocate in the Senate of others sharing in the problem of helping underdeveloped countries as well as the principal advocate of private enterprise assistance. Thus, I proposed that NATO countries get into the aid business. And for similar reasons I proposed the new businessmen's peace corps and tax credits for companies that extend their business into underdeveloped countries.

But just as consistent has been my insistence that our aid should neither go to our enemies or to those who bait us and tell us to jump in the lake. I have opposed sending food to Yugoslavia and Poland when they were closely allied with our enemies.

Now I oppose sending food to Indonesia and Egypt and I am the author of a bill to deny all aid to aggressors. My bill predates the recent action by the House to deny food shipments to Egypt because Nasser has seemed to support and—even foment—anti-American actions in his country.

Nasser told America to jump in a lake because he thinks he has us where he wants us.

The Middle East is a powder keg of proportions as great or greater than southeast Asia. Communism, neo-Nazism, age-old rivalries and poverty seethe and ferment in the sands and valleys of the Biblical world. In the background lie trade routes, chemicals, cotton, and oil.

Nasser is at once a stabilizing force and disruptive force. He holds the Arabs together, perhaps preventing all-out war. Yet, he rants and raves against us, against Israel and against our allies. He aids the enemies of peace and freedom in the Congo. He gets arms from the Russians and scientific brains from former German Nazis. He has received economic aid from us and food for peace. He has stood by while our buildings were burned and stoned. And then he told us to keep our aid.

As in Asia, it may be that our long-forgotten policies have caused this mess. It may be that we were too concerned over a latent threat to end our oil concessions. It may be that we were too hasty to stop the British and French from taking the Suez Canal and to stop the Israelis from cleaning out the Sinai Peninsula.

Nevertheless, America has never taken the kind of slap from a head of government that Nasser has accorded us.

The collective frustration of America found expression the other day in the House of Representatives when Congressmen wrote into an appropriations bill a provision that no more food was to be sent to Nasser.

Why, Congressmen and other Americans

asked, should we force nations to take our aid when their leaders have told us to keep it? Congress truly was expressing frustrations of Americans.

The authoritative William S. White wrote in his column of January 29:

"It would be a great mistake to suppose that partisan malice was a primary or even major Republican consideration here, just as it would be to suppose that the whole thing sprang from a desire to please American Jews. And other particular friends of Israel."

"Any notion that our foreign policy in the Middle East is run with special tenderness for Jewish feelings is one of the special idiocies of our time."

"The truth is that this Government through the greater part of three administrations has been exceedingly kind to Nasser's Egypt and, in the process, perforce, far from altogether kind to the Israelis, whom he persistently threatens to destroy."

"The truth also is that, while the Israelis are essentially on our side, Nasser consistently plays the international Communist game."

We Americans are slow to anger. We do not simply enter battles with the Communist aggressors for the joy of fighting.

Never in the history of the world has there been affluence such as we in America enjoy today. Never in the history of the world have the storehouses of grain and treasure been opened so fully so long to so many.

Yet we are resented and suspected. Even our benevolence is resented and rejected.

At the same time, courage and determination have earned us respect and friendship in our hours of trial. When President Kennedy blew the whistle on Russia and Cuba during the missile crisis, we won new respect throughout the world both for our President and our Nation. Every Latin American country, including those that had flirted previously with Castro, backed up. In Africa the Russians were denied use of a landing strip they had financed. The leader of that country told me a few weeks later that landing had been denied because we were right in our dispute with Cuba and they respected our determination and would not let the Russians interfere with our prosecution of our grievance.

A clear statement by our President, backed with the necessary force, earned us respect and new allies during the Cuban crisis.

I believe this has again become necessary in all our foreign affairs, including the Middle East and Far East.

The President has properly been described by both administration spokesmen and other responsible people as the sole architect of our foreign policy. It is, then, clearly his responsibility to spell that policy out in all its ramifications.

Just this week, a man from Indiana was in my office asking: "What is our foreign policy? What are we doing in Vietnam? In Egypt and the whole Middle East? What happened to the tremendous mandate won by Lyndon Johnson last November?"

I replied that the President had laid out a magnificent program for a better life for all Americans, for ridding our Nation of disease and poverty, for greater dignity of the individual and for paring other expenses to the bone. This was use of the mandate.

But my constituent asked again, "Why then does he not lay down an equally imaginative program for winning the 'cold war' For meeting the goals in the world?"

I explained to my constituent—and I now explain to you—the President's background. He was probably the greatest majority leader in the history of our land. He led by welding divergent elements and interests in the Senate into an effective coalition.

It was natural, then, that as President, he would again lead by bringing divergent elements together. The technique has become known as leading through consen-

sus. It has worked effectively with domestic programs and it resulted in the overwhelming victory of November 3. Leadership by consensus cannot be applied to foreign policy.

Yet, the President can and must use the reservoir of good will obtained through his amazing consensus at home to lead us and direct us abroad. As my constituent correctly pointed out, President Johnson enjoys unparalleled popularity among the people of America and a tremendous mandate to lead. Our country has, likewise, a reservoir of good will similar to that which we found available to us in the Cuban crisis when unknown allies leaped to our side.

President Johnson must dip into both these reservoirs and use them to point the way. He must clearly enunciate his goals and how he intends to reach them. In this way, and only in this way, will he obtain the support he needs to bring us the eventual victory.

The President should and must tell America, first, and the rest of the world what our posture is; what our aims are; what our interests and commitments are; how we intend to meet these commitments. We must know where we are going and what we are going to do in Vietnam. We need to know how the President plans to handle Nasser and Sukarno and others who may tell us off. He must tell Americans how they must serve the cause of freedom and peace.

America has both power and mercy. It has, in recent months, demonstrated both.

Yet, vacillation and indecision can be confused with weakness. Discussion of alternatives in Vietnam can, in the absence of clear policy, from the architect of policy, be mistaken for strife.

The time has come for us to be both American and Churchillian in our approach to these problems and to their eventual solution.

The President is more than capable of this role of leadership with strength and determination. He must now map out the road ahead, tell us what vehicles to use and then lead us up the road.

This is essential to American leadership in a hostile world.

We in America have the maturity, the moral fiber, the brains, the courage, the wealth and the power to carry out a policy of honesty, integrity, and devotion to peace and freedom.

Ultimately we shall triumph. We shall win a lasting victory for lasting peace, honor, and freedom.

We shall win it with a great President who clearly defines the role of each and all of us and who will lead us to the victory.

The 50th Anniversary of the Nonpartisan League of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLLAND REDLIN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 50th anniversary of the Nonpartisan League of North Dakota, a movement that spearheaded significant reforms for the agricultural areas of the Midwest.

From the Nonpartisan League, there sprang two great political parties—the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota and

the Progressive Party in Wisconsin. In North Dakota, the NPL has joined forces with the Democratic Party—and the organization is known as the Democratic-Nonpartisan League.

The Nonpartisan League concentrated, of course, on the problems of farmers, and its objectives were humanitarian, as well as economic. One of its primary goals, for example, was to strengthen educational opportunities for young people. Many credit the Nonpartisan League for developing the concept of central station electric power for rural America, culminating in the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration in 1935–36.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a product of the great Nonpartisan League tradition. My father enrolled as one of the pioneer members in 1916. My own political career began with membership on the State executive committee of the Young Nonpartisan League in the 1950's. In three races for the North Dakota State Legislature and in my race for Congress last fall, I have carried Nonpartisan League endorsement.

The modern Democratic-Nonpartisan League is keeping alive and vital the vision for a better life in rural America, as seen by the league pioneers of 50 years ago.

The February 1 edition of the *Minot Daily News of Minot, N. Dak.*, published an excellent article by Dick Dobson on the founding of the Nonpartisan League. I ask that it be reprinted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LEAGUE LAUNCHED HALF CENTURY AGO

(By Dick Dobson)

Fifty years ago this month, the Nonpartisan League, last of the historic and colorful agrarian protest movements, was born in North Dakota.

The NPL arose from the same discontent that produced the old Grange, the Greenback Party, the Farmers Alliance, the Populist Party and the other political action organizations which swept the Midwest in the late 19th century.

Always a fertile ground for agricultural agitation, North Dakota first rebelled in 1892 by going for the Populist presidential candidate, Gen. James B. Weaver.

As the old movements rose and fell, the embers of agrarian progressivism continued glowing in North Dakota until they burst into a full-scale political prairie fire in 1915.

Those flames, which spread into 13 States before they were extinguished, sprang up when North Dakota's 1915 Legislature declined to approve construction of a State-owned terminal elevator.

They were fanned by a State representative named Treadwell Twichell, who purportedly told a large delegation of farmers lobbying for the bill to "go home and slop the hogs."

Whether by design or chance, Arthur C. Townley, a onetime Socialist organizer and a bankrupt flax farmer, chose this propitious moment to launch the Nonpartisan League.

Townley had mulled over the idea of nonpartisan political action through control of the primary elections for some time, but it apparently was an associate of his, A. E. Bowen, who first advocated the plan.

Townley, then residing in Minot, drove the short distance to Deering in late February 1915 to "sell" Fred B. Wood, a prominent leader in the Equity Cooperative Exchange, on the idea.

In his book on the NPL, Robert L. Morlan said Townley got "a not too enthusiastic

greeting" upon arrival at the Wood farm. He continued:

"Mr. Wood and his two grown sons, Howard and Edwin, had heard many schemes of how to save the farmer, but their interest mounted as they listened to this intense young man who eagerly explained his plans until far into the night.

"F. B. Wood thought the whole proposition fantastic and unworkable, but Townley kept after him for 3 or 4 days, when at last youth, if not age, was won over.

"Late one evening, Howard Wood and Townley scribbled a brief 'platform' on a scrap of paper by the light of a kerosene lamp in the kitchen of the Wood farm, and early the next morning they started out in a bob-sled to talk to neighbors, Howard handling the introductions and Townley giving the sales talk."

The story of the NPL in its heyday from 1916, when it won control of State government, until 1921, when the Governor and other key officeholders were recalled, is well known.

One monographer credited it with bringing a "New Deal" to North Dakota when Franklin D. Roosevelt was only an obscure official in the U.S. Navy Department.

At its peak, the NPL had 200,000 dues-paying members. It evolved into the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota and joined with the Progressive Party in Wisconsin.

After crumbling as a national organization, the NPL still continued with occasional success in North Dakota. For 25 years, it was a personal vehicle of the late William Langer.

In 1956, the league broke its nominal Republican moorings and merged with the Democratic Party, a union which has produced new election triumphs.

Although the NPL is little more than a paper organization today, having been fully absorbed into Democratic machinery, it will live on, in name if not in fact.

The Nonpartisan League after 50 years is as native to the North Dakota political landscape as smoke-filled rooms and bombastic campaign oratory.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, so much has been written and spoken of Lincoln during the years intervening since his death that now our utterances are repetitious of something which has been written or spoken on some previous occasion. Out of the volumes that have been composed in testimony to Lincoln's greatness, none is more touching, more revealing, and more powerful than a memorial address delivered in this House exactly 49 years ago Friday by a Representative from Illinois, William A. Rodenberg. This oration has made a deep and lasting impression and whenever the name of Lincoln is spoken some phrase or some passage from it immediately comes to my mind.

In order that this memorable address may be brought to those who are now Members of the House and through these pages to the rest of the country, I am

including it as a part of my remarks today:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 12, 1918]

ADDRESS BY MR. RODENBERG

Fivescore and 7 years ago today the star of destiny shone resplendent over the cradle of an infant boy who, in the years to follow, was to be acclaimed by history as one of America's grandest contributions to the world's heritage of great and noble men. On that day, in a cabin home, amid the hills of Kentucky, Abraham Lincoln was born, and on this anniversary of his birth the memory of that great and godlike life thrills the soul of every American, giving him an inspiration of true nobility. [Applause.]

Abraham Lincoln—what a flood of mighty memories is awakened by that name. What a glorious panorama of patriotic achievement it presents to view. How it seems to fathom the very depths of duty and devotion, the innermost springs of sympathy and of sorrow. As we pronounce it reverently today the trials and tragedies and triumphs of the Nation's supremest struggle pass again in review before us and, rising above the stress and strife of conflict, grand and majestic, like some tall cliff "that midway leaves the storm," we behold the one great central figure of that epoch of heroism, the one neverfailing beacon light of national patriotism—our Lincoln—the world's Lincoln. [Applause.]

As I attempt today to pay tribute to a personality so great, a character so grand, so complex, and yet so simple, I am overwhelmed with a sense of my inability to do even partial justice to his name and fame. I shall content myself, therefore, with a brief reference to a few of his great traits of character which I believe have left a profound and lasting impression upon the American mind.

Why is it that no other name in the long roll of distinguished American statesmen stirs the heart of the Nation so deeply as that of Abraham Lincoln? Orators never weary of singing his praise, and hearers never tire of listening. Books on Lincoln multiply each year, and interest in them never flags. Every trivial relic of his homely life, every scrap of his writing, every prophetic saying, every jest, every anecdote, is treasured today by the people and bequeathed by them "as a rich legacy unto their issue."

It is not enough to say that Lincoln was a wise and patriotic President who died a martyr to a great cause. We have had other wise and devoted Presidents, and he is not the only martyr, but there is only one Lincoln. Washington we reverence, Jackson we admire, Lincoln we love. His memory is enshrined more deeply in the heart of the Nation than that of any other man, and there is none so close as he to the source of tears and of emotion.

This cannot be explained by the fact that Lincoln rose by manly effort from the humblest ranks of backwoods life to the highest position in the gift of any people. It cannot be accounted for by the fact that he was a noble embodiment of that splendid spirit of self-reliance that is bred of generations of lonely struggle under the shadow of the forest primeval. It is not even because he signed the great Proclamation of Emancipation.

These things are a part of the reason for the esteem in which we hold Lincoln, and so are his inexhaustible humor, his tense earnestness, his tireless industry, his history and fairness, his courage, and his steadfastness of purpose. His homely and unaffected words and ways had something to do with his popularity, and so had his sturdy commonsense. But not all of these sterling traits could make a Lincoln without

something additional; nor is the secret revealed by naming what is usually regarded as the crowning trait of his magnificent character—the fact that he always sought the right as God gave him to see the right, and that he devoted his life to a steadfast pursuance of it when once he was convinced he had found it. This will explain much, but it will never explain the flood of tender emotion that wells up from American hearts at mention of his incomparable name.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the true secret of our love for Lincoln was his own love for his fellow man. [Applause.] In his ungainly, giant form there was a heart of infinite human sympathy, and this is what illumined all his other traits of greatness and has made the imperishable halo that lingers around his head. [Applause.] Without these he might have achieved greatness, might have become President, might have freed the slaves as a political necessity, might even have brought the war to a successful close, and have fallen a victim to an assassin's bullet, and yet we should not today be speaking of him as we do. It is this one supreme trait of human sympathy that carries his name out of the realm of intellect into that of emotion. [Applause.]

It was this same deep human sympathy that caused Lincoln to hate slavery and to throw all of the power of his logic and eloquence against it. It was this, too, that enabled him to hold that marvelous balance of judgment which could put the Union above all else and could hold back emancipation until the right time. He could put himself in the place of the citizen of the border States and feel that any radical move would imperil the cause of freedom itself. This note of human sympathy sounded forth in his first inaugural; it ran throughout his relations with the soldiers during the great war, and animated his last acts as it had his first. The soldiers fighting on the field and dying in the hospital thought of him, and they said to each other: "He cares. He makes us fight, but he cares"; and they fought on as they never would have fought without that warmth of feeling for the head of the Nation.

Looking at the matter from any aspect and at any period of Lincoln's life, the prime cause of his greatness and of our present reverence for him is the fact that he was human in the best and truest sense of that fine word, and this is reason enough why the Nation loves the name of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

The fast-falling shadows of the past leave few names of men not enshrouded by their gloom. Many of the heroes of today will be lost to sight in the dimness of the approaching twilight. Tomorrow's sun will lighten up new shrines surrounded by tireless hosts of hero worshippers. As we look toward the past, earth's greatest heroes seem in strangest company—Christ and the condemned men, the missionary and the cannibal, Lincoln and the despised black man—there they stand together in the crowd, on Calvary, surrounded by jeering multitudes; but today they are together among the immortals. [Applause.] These saviors of the race will never be forgotten. Lincoln's heart solved more problems than his brain. His very gentleness made him the great emancipator, reconciler, the composite character of the American people. Hope, which is the prophet in every heart, was king and priest besides in his. It ruled his life and consecrated his deeds. Other men turned their backs in despair on the Republic's future; he, through densest darkness, saw with prescient light and gaze the glory of the coming dawn. [Applause.]

In the city of Springfield, in beautiful Oak Ridge Cemetery, he sleeps the sleep of eternity. Many are the times that I have stood with bowed head beside that sacred tomb and thought of the great soul that once inhabited the tenement of clay now moldering

into the dust from whence it came. And standing there in the presence of the mighty dead, my faith in humanity has been strengthened and my confidence in the perpetuity of the Republic and its glorious destiny has been made secure. [Applause.]

History tells us that when Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, was dying he asked that his heart be removed from his body and borne by knightly hands to the sacred sepulcher of the Saviour. Upon his death the Earl of Douglas, his trusted friend and companion, removed the heart from the body, placed it in a beautiful golden casket, and, surrounding himself with a number of brave young Scotch warriors, they set out on their holy mission. On the way they were attacked by a large body of Moors, who almost overcame them by force of superior numbers. When defeat seemed almost certain, Douglas took in his hand the sacred casket and hurled it far out into the midst of the enemy shouting:

"Lead on, heart of Bruce,
We follow thee!"

And the knights of Scotland, never having been defeated when following the leadership of Bruce, took new courage. They rushed upon the enemy with the fury of the whirlwind and gained the day. [Applause.]

Today the true and loyal citizens of this Republic, of whatever creed or ancestry, catching the inspiration that breathes upon them from the glorious memories of the past, with true American patriotism will take in their hand the great heart of Abraham Lincoln, encase it in their love, and hurl it far out into the midst of the enemy, shouting:

"Lead on, heart of Lincoln,
We follow thee;
We follow thee!"

[Prolonged applause.]

Hawaii Leads in Tropical and Subtropical Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has received worldwide acclaim as a center for the study of, and research in, tropical and subtropical agriculture and animal husbandry. For many years now, Hawaii by virtue of its mid-Pacific location, has acted as a pivot of information on tropical and subtropical agriculture and animal husbandry to the Pacific basin.

Recently, Hawaii's experts were called upon to assess the situation of livestock in Okinawa. A very able committee composed of Dr. Kenneth K. Otagaki, chairman of the State department of agriculture, Mr. Tokushi Tanaka, a University of Hawaii Extension Service poultry specialist, Mr. Williams L. Hugh, a swine specialist, Mr. Jack Ishida, agricultural economist, and State Representative Akira Sakima, a former pork producer, made up the consulting team.

Their recommendations were published in a report entitled "Livestock Production in the Ryukyu Islands." I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record a summary of its recommenda-